

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Applicants have reviewed the Office Action of December 28, 2007 (“the Office Action”). Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 20, 21, 23, 29, and 38 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims.

### **35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections**

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-22 and 38-44, at pages 15-16 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 38 to remove “response to initiation of.” Claim 1 now recites “initiating presentation of a graphical user interface (GUI) element by a presentation engine to a caller’s device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call, after the caller has been identified.” Support for the amended language can be found in steps 30 and 32 of FIG. 1 and paragraph 0013.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-22 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 18-13, and 15-22 should be withdrawn.

In similar fashion, Applicants submit that “presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call comprising call participants, after the caller has been identified” as recited in claim 38, is also supported by the specification in paragraph 0028. Claims 40-44 depends from claim 38. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection of claims 38 and 40-44 should be withdrawn.

Applicants have canceled claim 39 without prejudice or disclaimer in a previous response. Canceling claim 39 (in the previous response) renders the rejection of claim 39 moot.

**Claims 23, 26, 29 and 45 are Allowable**

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 23, 26, 29, and 45, at pages 16-19 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,465 ("Pickett").

**Claims 23 and 26**

Pickett does not disclose or suggest computer-readable data executable by the processor to initiate presentation of a participant GUI having an appearance different than the host GUI by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in the collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as recited in amended claim 23. In contrast to claim 23, Pickett discloses an office attendant type program that may transfer received calls to other extensions because, e.g., a called party is on the phone. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 22-27. Pickett further discloses that the office attendant type program may cause one or more windows to appear on the computers of particular persons in the office, such as a person to whom a call is being directed. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 38-41. Thus, the person to whom a call is being directed cannot be a caller joining in the collaborative call. As a further prerequisite to initiate presentation of the participant GUI, the caller is identified. Therefore, Pickett does not disclose that the participant GUI is to a device associated with a caller joining in the collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 23. Thus, Pickett does not disclose each and every element of claim 23. Hence, claim 23 is allowable. Claim 26 depends from claim 23, and is therefore allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 23.

**Claims 29 and 45**

Pickett does not disclose a collaborative call system, comprising: a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the second GUI differs from the first GUI, as in claim 29. In contrast to claim 29, Pickett discloses an office attendant type program that may transfer received calls to other extensions because, e.g., a called party is on the phone. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 22-27. Pickett further discloses that the office attendant type program may cause one or more windows to appear on the computers of particular

persons in the office, such as a person to whom a call is being directed. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 38-41. Thus, the person to whom a call is being directed cannot be a caller joining in the collaborative call. As a further prerequisite to initiate presentation of the second GUI, the caller is identified. Therefore, Pickett does not disclose that the initiation of the presentation of the second GUI is on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, as in claim 29. Thus, Pickett does not disclose each and every element of claim 29. Hence, claim 29 is allowable. Claim 45 depends from claim 29, and is therefore allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 29.

### **Claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 12, 20, and 24 are allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 12, 20, and 24, at pages 20-25 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett. Applicants traverse the remaining rejections.

### **Claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 12, and 20**

Pickett does not disclose or suggest a collaborative call method comprising: initiating presentation of a graphical user interface (GUI) element by a presentation engine to a caller's device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as in claim 1. The Office Action admits that Pickett teaches "the office attendant type program may cause one or more windows to appear on the computers of particular persons in the office, such as a person to whom a call is being directed." *See* Office Action, pp. 5. Thus, the person to whom a call is being directed cannot be a caller joining in the collaborative call. As a further prerequisite to initiate presentation of the GUI, the caller is identified. Hence, Pickett even as modified in the Office Action does not disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Pickett. Claims 2-3, 6, 8-9, 12, and 20 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

### **Claim 24**

As previously described, claim 23 is allowable. Claim 24 depends from claim 23, and is therefore allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 23.

### **Claims 10, 11, 13, 15-19, 25, and 27-28 are Allowable**

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, 15-19, 25, and 27-28, at pages 25-26 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0169291 ("Nakata").

### **Claims 10, 11, 13, and 15-19**

As explained above, Pickett does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, from which claims 10, 11, 13, and 15-19 depend. Nakata does not disclose the elements of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Pickett. For example, Nakata fails to disclose or suggest initiating presentation of a graphical user interface (GUI) element by a presentation engine to a caller's device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Nakata discloses commencing a desktop conference by having clients connect to a public Web server of a vendor via Internet browser. *See* Nakata, paragraph 0054. After the connection is established the client must then click a desired conference link from among a displayed list, after which a desktop conference screen is displayed that includes a list of participants. *See* Nakata, paragraph 0054 and Fig. 7. Hence, in Nakata, the initiating presentation is not by a presentation engine but based on the client clicking a desired conference link. Therefore, the asserted combination of Pickett and Nakata fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, or of claims 10, 11, 13, and 15-19, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1. Hence, claims 10, 11, 13, and 15-19 are allowable over the combination of Pickett and Nakata.

### **Claims 25, 27 and 28**

As explained above, Pickett fails to disclose or suggest computer-readable data executable by the processor to initiate presentation of a participant GUI having an appearance different than the host GUI by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in the collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 23, from which claims 25, 27 and 28 depend. In contrast to claim 23, Nakata discloses a common desktop

conference screen for each client and the same desktop conference screen for the process engineer of the vendor. *See* Nakata, paragraph 0054. Furthermore, Nakata discloses commencing a desktop conference by having clients connect to a public Web server of a vendor via Internet browser. See Nakata, paragraph 0054. After the connection is established the client must then click a desired conference link from among a displayed list, after which a desktop conference screen is displayed that includes a list of participants. *See* Nakata, paragraph 0054 and Fig. 7. Hence, in Nakata, the initiating presentation is not by a presentation engine but based on the client clicking a desired conference link. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Pickett and Nakata fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 23, or of claims 25, 27 and 28, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 23. Therefore, claims 25, 27 and 28 are allowable over the asserted combination of Pickett and Nakata.

#### **Claims 1, 3-4 and 21-22 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 1, 3-4 and 21-22, at pp. 27-29 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,010,107 (“Lee”). Applicants traverse the remaining rejections.

The Office Action admits that Lee teaches a GUI element to be displayed because of and concurrent to initiation of a collaborative call so that a customer can “monitor” and “moderate” the call. *See* Office Action, page 27. Thus, Lee does not disclose or suggest initiating presentation of a graphical user interface (GUI) element by a presentation engine to a caller’s device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Lee fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, or of claims 3-4 and 21-22, which depend from claim 1. Hence, claims 1, 3-4 and 21-22 are allowable over Lee.

#### **Claims 30-33, 35, 37-38, 41, and 43-44 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 30-33, 35, 37-38, 41, and 43-44, at pp. 29-34 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,118 (“Bayless”). Applicants traverse the remaining rejections.

**Claims 30-33, 35, and 37**

Picket and Bayless fail to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 29. For example, Pickett does not disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, as in claim 29. Instead, Pickett discloses an office attendant type program that may transfer calls received to other extensions because, e.g., a called party is on the phone. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 22-27. Pickett further discloses that in such cases the office attendant type program may cause one or more windows to appear on the computer of, e.g., a person to whom a call is being directed. *See* Pickett, col. 18, lines 38-41. Bayless discloses a call window with a conference call in progress that a user may initiate. *See* Bayless, col. 26, lines 46-54. Bayless also discloses a conference controller that allows a user to place all parties to a conference on hold, or to hang up the entire conference, by pressing the appropriate button. *See* Bayless, col. 27, lines 1-4. Bayless does not disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified. Therefore, Pickett and Bayless, separately or in combination, do not disclose each element of claim 29, or of claims 30-33, 35 and 37, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 29. Hence, claims 29-33, 35 and 37 are allowable.

**Claims 38, 41, and 43-44**

Picket and Bayless fail to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 38. For example, Pickett does not disclose presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call comprising call participants, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 38. Regarding claim 38, the Office Action admits that Pickett teaches “the office attendant type program may cause one or more windows to appear on the computers of particular persons in the office, such as a person to whom a call is being directed.” *See* Office Action, pp. 5. Thus,

the person to whom a call is being directed cannot be a caller joining in the collaborative call. As a further prerequisite to the presentation of the GUI, the caller is identified. In contrast to claim 38, Bayless discloses a call window with a conference call in progress that a user may initiate. *See* Bayless, col. 26, lines 46-54. Bayless does not disclose presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call comprising call participants after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 38. Therefore, the combination of Pickett and Bayless does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 38, or of claims 41 and 43-44, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 38. Hence, claims 38 and 41 and 43-44 are allowable.

#### **Claim 40 is allowable**

The Office has rejected claim 40, at page 34 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett in view of Bayless and further in view of Lee. Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 40 over Pickett in view of Bayless, and further in view of Lee. As explained above, the combination of Pickett and Bayless does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 38, from which claim 40 depends. Further, Lee does not disclose or suggest presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call comprising call participants, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 38. The Office Action admits that Lee teaches a GUI element to be displayed because of and concurrent to initiation of a collaborative call so that a customer can “monitor” and “moderate” the call. *See* Office Action, page 27. Therefore, the combination of Pickett, Bayless and Lee does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 38 from which claim 40 depends. Therefore, claim 40 is allowable.

#### **Claim 36 is allowable**

The Office has rejected claim 36, at pp. 34-35 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett in view of Bayless and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,235 (“Goldman”). Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 36 over Pickett in view of Bayless, and further in view of Goldman. As explained above, the combination of Pickett and Bayless does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 29, from which claim 36

depends. Goldman does not disclose the elements of claim 29 that are not disclosed by Pickett and Bayless. For example, Goldman does not disclose a collaborative call system, comprising: a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the second GUI differs from the first GUI, as recited in claim 29. Instead, Goldman discloses a POTS/Packet bridge that can be used to set up a conference call with the convenience of a point and click interface. *See* Goldman, col. 13, lines 28-30. Therefore, the combination of Pickett, Bayless and Goldman fails to disclose each element of claim 29, or of claim 36, by virtue of its dependence from claim 29. Hence, claim 36 is allowable.

#### **Claim 42 is allowable**

The Office has rejected claim 42, at pp. 35-36 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Pickett in view of Bayless and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,271 ("Sawyer"). Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 42 over Pickett in view of Bayless, and further in view of Sawyer. As explained above, the combination of Pickett and Bayless does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 38, from which claim 42 depends. Sawyer does not disclose the elements of claim 38 that are not disclosed by Pickett and Bayless. For example, Sawyer does not disclose presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining in a collaborative call comprising call participants, after the caller has been identified, as recited in claim 38. Instead, Sawyer discloses a system for authentication of caller identification of a caller for accessing a conference. Sawyer provides a voice indication of participants that join or leave the conference. *See* Sawyer, col. 7, lines 20-38. Therefore, the combination of Pickett, Bayless and Sawyer fails to disclose each element of claim 38, or of claim 42, by virtue of its dependence from claim 38. Hence, claim 42 is allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants



respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-16-2008  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicants  
TOLER LAW GROUP  
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5575 (fax)